

### REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has cancelled claims 2, 20, 24, 28, 29, 39 and 45 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 15, 19, 23, 25, 28, 38 and 44 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1, 3-19, 21-23, 25-27, 30-38, 40-44 and 46-48 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 44-48 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Further, claims 1, 15-17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27-29, 36-38 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0167315 (Chowdhry et al.). Claims 2-9, 18, 22, 26, 30-35, 39-43 and 45-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al.). Claims 10-14, 21, 25 and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0152110 (Stewart et al.).

#### 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claims 44-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant has amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

#### 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 15-17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27-29, 36-38 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chowdhry, et al. Applicant has canceled claims 20, 24, 28 and 29 rendering these rejections moot. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as to the remaining pending claims.

Chowdhry, et al. discloses fast creation of custom web portals being permitted by parsing targeted web pages into nested tables, and then selecting which table is to be a portlet in the custom portal. A parser controller and associated JavaScript parser execute all encountered JavaScript statements and replace them with results, making the resultant portlet images easier to parse and manipulate. The provided software produces portlets having several window-like capabilities, including minimizing and

maximizing portlets, tiling or superimposing portlets, and dragging and dropping them to any user-selected location on the custom portal page. The user can preselect refresh rates. The portlets can be of pane, link or form varieties. The user also has the option of using portlets whose characteristics are stored in a repository by a network administrator. The software resides on a server and the user/client only needs a browser to employ the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 15, 19, 23, 27, 38 and 44, Applicant submits that Chowdhry, et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination in each of these claims of, *inter alia*, freezing a portlet content in the selected portlet except a reactivation feature in response to deactivating the selected portlet, or wherein the deactivated selected portlet is prevented from being moved, closed, edited or affected. The Examiner asserts that Chowdhry, et al. discloses deactivating a selected portlet in response to operating a deactivation feature, in paragraph 270, and reactivating the selected portlet in response to operating a reactivation feature, in paragraph 271. However, these portions merely disclose that to minimize a portlet, the user can click the minimize button at the top right corner of the pane or select minimize from a menu and to restore a portlet the user can select a restore button. This is not freezing a portlet content in a selected portlet in response to deactivating the selected portlet, where the deactivated portlet is prevented from being moved, closed, edited or affected, as recited in the claims of the present application. Chowdhry, et al. merely discloses minimizing a portlet and restoring a portlet. This is clearly affecting the portlet. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to freezing a portlet where the portlet is prevented from being moved, closed, edited or affected. Chowdhry, et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. On page 6 of the Office Action in the rejection of claims 2 and 45, the Examiner admits that Chowdhry does not disclose or suggest freezing of portlet content in response to deactivating the selected portlet, but asserts that minimizing a portlet by selecting a minimizing feature in turn freezes the contents by eliminating user interaction with the minimize portlet. However, freezing a portlet content, as recited in the claims of the present application, and the minimizing a portlet,

as disclosed in Chowdhry, et al. are clearly two different concepts. Minimizing a portlet as disclosed in Chowdhry, et al. does not disclose or suggest preventing a deactivated selected portlet from being moved, closed, edited or affected. In fact, closing or minimizing a portlet is clearly affecting the portlet.

Regarding claims 16, 17 and 36-38, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 10 (discussed following), and 27, and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Chowdhry, et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 15-17, 19, 23, 27, 36-38 and 44 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

#### 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 2-9, 18, 22, 26, 30-35, 39-43 and 45-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 15, 19, 23, 27, 38 and 44 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Chowdhry, et al. does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 3-9, 18, 22, 26, 30-35, 40-43, 46 and 47 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 10-14, 21, 25 and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry, et al. in view of Stewart, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Stewart, et al. discloses collecting market research data on-line through the use of a Web-hosted interactive multi-media software application. This system collects participants' responses and reactions to pre-determined stimuli utilizing interactive participation via computers to collect data while adhering to scientific and proven market research methodologies. When the system is hosted on a web accessible

resource, participants access the system via unique universal resource locators (URLs). Such responses are recorded, scored and stored in a text file in a hidden frame that remains state throughout the execution of the survey. Once all the responses are scored and stored, the text in the hidden frame is then sent to the administrator's server for storage and subsequent analysis.

Regarding claim 10, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination in this claim of, *inter alia*, deactivating a selected portlet in response to operating a deactivation feature where the deactivated selected portlet is prevented from being moved, closed or edited or affected. As noted previously, Chowdhry, et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Minimizing a portlet as disclosed in Chowdhry, et al. is affecting the portlet.

Moreover, none of the cited references disclose or suggest overlaying the selected portlet with an electronic pane or window to block all inputs of the selected portlet while the selected portlet is deactivated. The Examiner admits that Chowdhry, et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that Stewart, et al. discloses these limitations at page 4, paragraph 51. However, these portions merely disclose preventing a participant from responding too soon to a survey by overlaying a layer over the webpage that is loading the graphic. This is not overlaying the selected portlet to block all inputs of the selected portlet while the selected portlet is deactivated, as recited in the claims of the present application. Stewart discloses overlaying a layer over an entire web page. Stewart does not disclose or suggest a selected portlet or overlaying the selected portlet with an electronic pane or window while the selected portlet is deactivated. Further, the combination of Chowdhry, et al. and Stewart, et al. makes no sense since Chowdhry, et al. discloses minimizing a portlet and Stewart, et al. discloses overlaying a layer over the entire web page. Clearly, if the portlet is minimized (by Chowdhry et al.), Stewart cannot then overlay a layer over a portlet since the portlet has been minimized and is not displayed on the webpage.

Regarding claims 11-14, 21, 25 and 48, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 10, 19, 23 and 44 and, therefore, are

patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 10-14, 21, 25 and 48 of the present application.

Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-19, 21-23, 25-27, 30-38, 40-44 and 46-48 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about the present Amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick R. Guido  
(Applicant)

Date: July 10, 2007

By: 

Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282  
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC  
430 Davis Drive  
Suite 500  
Morrisville, N.C. 27560  
Telephone: (919) 286-8000  
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199